REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 17, 2008. Claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Thus, claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47 are pending in the present response. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 25-26 and 28-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent No. 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereinafter referred to as "Kopetzky". Applicant respectfully disagree.

Miller describes a graphical user interface that presents a current document along with thumbnail images of documents, relevant to the current document (Miller, Abstract; Column 3, line 63 to Column 4, line 35). The content of each thumbnail, or related document, is predetermined according to an "automatic content analysis procedure" (Miller, Column 5, lines 21-38). When a "user desires to access one of these documents, the user selects the appropriate thumbnail 270 via a user-input device (not shown), such as a computer mouse, trackball, etc., such selection subsequently causes the desired document to be displayed on the display pane" (Miller, Column 4, lines 35-44). The automatic content analysis procedure then automatically loads a new set of thumbnails corresponding to the newly selected document (Miller, Column 7, line 66 to Column 8, line 2).

Kopetzky describes a method and system for providing a user with a visual preview for link traversal on a web page (Kopetzky, pages 2-5). When a mouse pointer moves over a link on a web page, a preview image is generated (Kopetzky, page 5). The preview image is generated

in the form of a thumbnail sized image below the link and displayed in the web page (Kopetzky,

page 5; Figure 5).

Claim 25 recites:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display, the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area, displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display, and displaying in a third display area a plurality of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained within the other document;

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishing from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document;

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display; and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to a user.

(Emphasis Added)

As set forth above in Claim 25, a current document is displayed in a first area and another

document is displayed in a second display. In response to a first signal indicating a pointer over

a link, the second display area displays a representation of content of another document

associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the

current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of

the display. Furthermore, in response to the signal indicating the pointer over the link, a plurality

of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained

<u>within the other document is displayed.</u> Applicant respectfully submits that Miller and Kopetzky, taken alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest this feature.

Miller describes a system in which a user is required to select thumbnails in order to display content associated with that particular thumbnail (Miller, Column 4, lines 35-44). However, Miller fails to describe, in response to a signal indicating a pointer over a link, "displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display" or displaying concepts of interest of a document in a third display area of the display (Office Action, mailed January 17, 2008, page 6).

The Examiner therefore relies on Kopetzky to remedy the shortcomings of Miller. Kopetzky describes a system for providing a visual link preview (Kopetzky, pages 2-3). Kopetzky states that three link types may be visualized. URL links that point to the beginning of a web page or anchor page are visualized as thumbnail sized JPEG images of the link target. Further, if an anchor link has text after the anchor, the text is presented in a pop up box. Finally, non-URL links are visualized as a symbol representing the protocol of the link (Kopetzky, pages 3-4 and 7-8). Thus, Kopetzky provides for link previews based on link type, in the form of graphic images or text.

Applicant, however, claims "in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area … displaying in a third display area <u>a plurality of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained within the other document</u>." Kopetzky only describes creating a reduced resolution JPEG of a link target, providing the text

of a link target, or providing a symbol illustrating the protocol of the link. None of the visualizations described by Kopetzky are based concepts for content contained within other documents. Rather, Kopetzky provides for static visualizations based on link type, which is not related to a plurality of concepts based on the content within a document. The visualizations of Kopetzky are displayed regardless of the content of linked content or concepts within that content.

Furthermore, Kopetzky provides for a single visualization for each link (i.e., either a JPEG preview, text associated with a link, or a graphic symbol). The visualizations provided by Kopetzky merely describes visualizations based on link type, but not visualizations based on concepts from content within a document. One would not reasonably understand Kopetzky's singular visual link preview as describing or even suggesting "a plurality of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained within the other document." For example, and as illustrated in the Applicant's specification, a plurality of concept indicators may specify a plurality of concepts such as Agents, Java, NLP, etc. based on the content of another document (*See* Specification, Figures 7A-7B).

Therefore, for at least the responses discussed above, Kopetzky also fails to describe or suggest "in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area ... displaying in a third display area a plurality of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained within the other document."

Therefore, neither Miller nor Kopetzky, alone or in combination, describe or suggest each and every limitation claimed by the Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome by the remarks. Since independent claims 32, 39, 46, and 47 contain similar features and limitations to those discussed above, claims 32, 39, 46, and 47 are also not rendered obvious by Miller in view of Kopetzky under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for similar reasons. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Further, dependent claims 26, 28-31, 33-38, and 40-45 depend from claims 25, 32, and 39, and include additional features and limitations. Since claims 25, 32, and 39 were not rendered obvious by Miller in view of Kopetzky under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Miller and Kopetzky, alone or in combination, also fails to render obvious claims 26, 28-31, 33-38, and 40-45. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent No. 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereinafter referred to as "Kopetzky", and further in view of Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,678). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 25, Miller and Kopetzky fail to describe or suggest in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed in the first display area … displaying in a third display area a plurality of concept indictors specifying a plurality of concepts of interest based on content contained within the other document." Aalbersberg describes a search engine system that highlights user entered search terms in search results (Aalbersberg, column 5, lines 45-67; column 6, lines 1-20), and fails to remedy the shortcomings of Miller and Kopetzky. Therefore, Miller, Kopetzky, and Aalbersberg, alone or in combination fail to render claim 25,

and thus dependent claim 27, obvious under § 103. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal

of the rejection of claim 27.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: April 17, 2008   /Michael J. Mallie/
                                Michael J. Mallie
                                Reg. No. 36,591

                                1279 Oakmead Parkway
                                Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
                                (408) 720-8300